

BUILDING A LIBRARY SUBCULTURE TO SUSTAIN INFORMATION LITERACY PRACTICE WITH SECOND ORDER CHANGE

Carrol Wetzel Wilkinson
West Virginia University

Courtney Bruch
Colorado Mesa University

ABSTRACT

This article addresses development for information literacy (IL) practice through building internal library organizational culture. Using an analysis of relevant literature and reflection on lived experience, the authors explore issues and concepts for instruction librarians and leaders to consider as they advance and sustain IL initiatives. Through a lens of second order change the article proposes change agency theory and organizational development as theoretical approaches: calling on librarians to adopt roles and techniques that honor personal learning and continuing education while simultaneously focusing on student learning. The authors also suggest a flexible roadmap for managed change processes including organizational assessment techniques, inspiration for conversations and inclusive dialogues, reasons for and ways to address resistance, and steps to implement action plans. The authors conclude IL initiatives will be more effective if supported by an internal library culture that is embraced and implemented by knowledgeable instruction librarians and their leaders.

INTRODUCTION

Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) recently revised their “Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices” in an attempt to identify and describe features notable in information literacy (IL) programs. Quickly defined, a fully evolved IL program is characterized by a mission statement and goals or objectives as well as efforts in planning, administrative and institutional support, articulation or program sequence within the curriculum, pedagogy, staffing, outreach, and assessment or evaluation (ACRL, 2012). Yet several information science scholars (Bruch & Wilkinson, 2012; Oakleaf, 2011; Ondrusek, 2008; Gibson, 2007) note library staff acceptance and ownership of IL programs is not widespread. In her ethnographic study of the experiences, practices and feelings of academic librarians who teach IL Seymour (2012) says, “The primary roadblocks to information literacy programs.....are institutional and cultural” (p. 64). Seymour also indicates, “Although many participants had clear views of what the ideal [IL program] is, none felt the profession is close to meeting that ideal on any consistent level” (p. 66).

The challenges associated with developing a library subculture conducive to IL, including a mindful work environment that provides a learning community for instruction librarians, can be addressed by applying findings from both library and organizational culture literature. Librarians who wish to develop an IL-friendly culture and experiment with applications of change agency theory should review their individual workplace experiences via emerging scholarship, such as Schein’s (2010) *Organizational Culture and Leadership* or Travis’s 2008 article entitled

“Librarians as Agents of Change.” Such scholarship showcases methods for relieving organizational discord and managing change to not only embrace IL as a developing paradigm in academic libraries, but also to holistically effect transformative, second order change. Expanding on these ideas, the authors propose a roadmap in which organizational assessment is undertaken to encourage conversations, recognize and address resistance to change, and foster further dialogues and action plans to place IL programs on sound footing for the future.

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND IL INSTRUCTION

To understand the organizational context in which IL instruction is currently integrated into the library workgroup culture, it is helpful to briefly explore the characteristics of organizational culture at large. Schein¹ (2010) uses culture as a means to study group dynamics and organizations. He defines organizational culture as the following:

...a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solves its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (Schein, 2010, p. 18).

Schein says organizational and occupational culture really consist of macro cultures (for example, the academic library operates within the culture of a college or university) and subcultures that reflect functional units (for example, technical or public services units within the academic library) (2010, pp. 55-7). Schein argues culture provides the

ability to explain aspects of what happens in organizations through three phenomena: “(1) visible artifacts; (2) espoused beliefs, values, rules, and behavioral norms; and (3) tacit, taken-for-granted, basic underlying assumptions” (p. 53). Throughout this article we will refer to IL subculture in relationship to both the profession and how an individual library relates internally to IL.

Schein’s phenomena model of organizational culture analysis can easily be applied to IL subculture. According to Schein, artifacts are visible and feelable structures or processes that are both easy to obtain but difficult to decipher (2010, p. 24). Handouts, webpages, or procedures for scheduling classes are examples of artifacts librarians have developed for IL programs. Espoused beliefs and values, according to Schein, include the ideals, goals, aspirations, ideologies, and rationalizations of the organization’s values. They are often articulated because they serve the normative or moral function of guiding members of the group in how they deal with certain key situations (2010, pp. 24-7). Most library leaders write mission statements and policies for these reasons, explaining their unique functions yet closely aligning their partnership with the larger institution.

Finally, underlying assumptions, according to Schein, are unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs and personal values; they determine behavior, perception, thought, and feeling. These assumptions tend to be non-confrontable and non-debatable, and are extremely difficult to change (2010, pp. 27-32). Underlying assumptions may contain clues to describe otherwise elusive personal definitions a librarian or group of librarians have set for themselves when considering their overall instructional place in higher education institutions. Furthermore, underlying assumptions

manifest in workplace experience; so unraveling their impact can help to not only identify them, but also to reflect critically upon their meaning.

For example, some instruction librarians hold the underlying assumption that past practices are sufficient; others assume it is time to experiment with new learning documentation and pedagogical techniques. Some librarians believe instruction is a priority while others believe that competing priorities, such as collection development or management of e-content, leave little time to think deeply about influencing IL curriculum. As librarians committed to instruction, the authors share the underlying assumptions that IL demands experimentation with pedagogy and assessment as well as a role change (described, in part, in the ACRL 2007 standards and proficiencies document)² and shifted priorities that include a greater focus on education endeavors. This assumption additionally demands a paradigm shift to student learning outcomes accompanied by growth and development for librarians as instructors. Hidden, underlying assumptions such as these are rarely, if ever, explored in operational work life. Yet they can greatly influence individual and administrative decisions, and in some cases, prevent discovery or new opportunities that may lead to significant change. Furthermore, conflicting and underexplored underlying assumptions can make IL program implementation difficult and can hamper the quality of instructional practice.

Schein notes, “for organizations to be effective ...subcultures must be in alignment with each other because each is needed for organizational effectiveness” (2010, p. 68). IL in higher education is experiencing this very problem. As a developing culture within library and higher

educational organizations, it is replete with examples of inconsistencies between workplace subcultures, espoused values, and underlying assumptions. For example, librarians are expected to teach both mandatory or credit bearing courses and single instructional sessions, yet “only one-fifth of ARL [Association of Research Libraries] libraries consider teaching a key element of their mission” (Oakleaf, 2011, p. 62). While the ARL does not represent all academic libraries, this statistic does at least highlight a startling conflict between institutional expectation and professional self-identity in a significant portion of academic libraries. The literature (Bruch & Wilkinson, 2012; Bennett, 2007; Grassian & Kaplowitz, 2009; Budd, 2009; Oakleaf, 2011) notes disagreements among librarians that indicate an inconsistency between espoused beliefs and mismatched underlying assumptions which undermine internal IL program development.

This disagreement directly effects support such as continuing education opportunities, travel remuneration, and/or released time for research. These are important options which are not available to all instructional librarians. When librarians examine underlying assumptions surrounding IL, inconsistencies may be brought to light. Discussion of the conflicting values discovered can go a long way toward culture building. To fully support librarians shifting paradigms toward IL, it is important to understand the complexities of change within an organization.

SINGLE ORDER VS. SECOND ORDER CHANGE IN IL PROGRAM INITIATIVES

For IL program development through culture building to be successful, library

leaders must adopt a clear view of the type of change that is required. Single order change alters operations and second order change digs deeper in the organization’s make-up and requires the adoption of new values within an altered social system.

Small operational changes are common in library practice, especially for service delivery. A few like-minded librarians may talk about a change they would like to make in reaction to workplace circumstances. Then they might form an action plan and implement it. It may take time and the agreement of many people, but it represents a single order change, i.e. “it involves structural or procedural changes that can be made within the organization’s current frameworks or rules, procedures, and leadership roles” (Komives, Wagner, & Associates, 2009, p. 103). In academic library environments, examples might include alterations in the online catalog display features, policy changes for paying fines for overdue materials, new ways of collecting statistics on virtual reference questions, or even a change away from the use of referring to “reference” departments and instead adopting the name “research services.” These changes can be classified as the type librarians frequently implement. Single order change often receives support without negative emotion, fear of identity change, or loss of psychological safety.

In contrast, it is different when someone advocates a change to the library workplace that is more all-encompassing and complicated, such as adopting a paradigm shift from teaching to learning (Barr & Tagg, 1995) or embracing a new educational identity to strengthen the IL program. This might be a change no one else believes is needed or a few people *are* interested in, but it comes with an emotional element that suggests threat. For example,

an instructional librarian might see a need to improve coordination and curricular alignment but might find it too difficult or intimidating to try alone. He or she could talk with colleagues and/or request a conference with a manager, department head or dean. Together, they can discuss modifying underlying assumptions and creating cohesive values related to an IL program. Such an undertaking is ambitious and delicate at the same time. This type of change, second order, can be defined as:

Changing an organization's fundamental values or assumptions. [Second order change is] sometimes referred to as transformative change, which 1) alters the culture of the institution by changing select underlying assumptions and institutional behaviors, processes, and products; 2) is deep and pervasive affecting the whole institution 3) is intentional, and 4) occurs over time. (Komives et al., 2009, p. 103)

An example of a fundamental assumption in library culture where second order change can be applied will clarify this point. One assumption is that librarian contributions to their organizations are somewhere between incidental and important, but not *essential* to institutional achievement. The notion that reveals a shift in thinking and embraces IL is that librarians are powerful institutional partners whose contributions are essential to organizational effectiveness and overall student success. Another critical part of this assumption is that 1) the internal organizational structure supports librarian advocacy for promotion of IL subculture and 2) librarians believe in their ability to do so.

Instruction librarians may benefit from reflection on just how great the changes are

or could be with a fully evolved IL program (ACRL, 2012) and framed by a full understanding of second order change. An expanded and enriched set of values could also include the intentional coordination of teaching and learning efforts, a paradigm shift to student learning outcomes, assessment of student learning, and growth and development for librarians as instructors. The reflection we suggest here must include lived experience.³

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF IL CULTURE AND PROGRAMS

As the authors analyzed the scholarship discovered in this study and our lived experience, we began to see a way forward for instruction librarians. The mysteries of deep social change required by IL program development in our work groups and throughout our institutions became less ambiguous and more manageable. What follows is a discussion of what, to us, seems one logical way for change agent librarians, or librarians who see the implications we are discussing here and accept responsibility for them, to proceed through the process of culture building for IL practice.

Program development for IL is highly aspirational. It ambitiously aims to influence whole organizations and recognize key instruction librarians as agents of change. Yet concrete policy statements of such aspirations often do not exist in libraries where IL principles are taught. Furthermore, instruction librarians often do not see themselves as agents of change who can use their professional power to shape policy. Unraveling this commendable yet amorphous (and perhaps naïve) environment and consciously building a leadership subculture for IL is essential in order to

achieve effective program development and a healthy work environment for instruction librarians.

It is one thing to define second order change and quite another to implement it. To review, it digs deep in an organization's make-up and requires adoption of new values. It changes the culture of the institution by mindfully addressing select underlying assumptions and behaviors, processes, and products, and finally, it happens over time. Second order change cannot happen without clear buy-in by key leaders, clarification of the new values and mindful adoption of them, clarification as well of the old values that are no longer in effect, and setting goals and a timeline for precisely what will be changed in the working culture (Travis, 2008).

In library instruction programs that are working toward transformative change (another way to look at second order change) the changes we speak of here are in three different interconnected areas. They include the instruction librarians themselves and how they view their place and agency in higher education, the librarians' working relationship to the faculty, and the librarians' use of faculty governance pathways to make change in the institution. In considering the librarians' view of themselves, confidence in the value and power of their teaching expertise and the critical importance of the intellectual principles of IL are central values of importance. Building instructional collaborations with faculty colleagues and sustaining them over time is also critical. Finally, leaving the library and working in the politics of the campus to address and implement curriculum change is the final and most difficult part of overall second order change for instruction librarians. Taken together, these interconnected areas

are central components of culture building for IL practice and do involve second order change.

Schein (2010) distinguishes two types of change processes: natural change and managed change. Natural change processes evolve while managed change processes can be initiated if evolutionary change processes are too slow or headed in the wrong direction (p. 273). Some academic libraries have an IL culture characterized by established library and institutional support. Other libraries struggle to manifest strong internal and external support for IL efforts (Seymour, 2012). In the latter example, managed change can be adopted. In cases of managed change, Schein (2010) recommends three stages: 1) creating the motivation to change, 2) learning new concepts (or new meanings for old concepts and new standards for judgment), and 3) internalizing new concepts, meanings, and standards (p. 300). Learning and internalizing concepts allows for the building of shared values and assumptions about librarian identity as both educators and change agents.

Cited often in library literature (Stephens & Russell 2004; Holloway 2004; Deiss 2004; Gilstrap 2009; Parsch & Baughman 2010), organizational development (OD) is an evolving management approach to change. Although the literature of OD does not all agree, Stephens and Russell (2004) practically defined OD is "an ongoing, thoughtfully planned effort by all members of the organization to improve how that organization operates, serves its stakeholders, fulfills its mission, and approaches its vision" (p. 241). Deiss (2004, p. 27) wrote about fostering innovation in libraries by distilling four areas for OD work in libraries: 1) organizational assessment (in order to develop an

organizational baseline), 2) develop a dialogue about innovation and strategy, 3) invest in organizational learning and teach staff to be innovative strategic thinkers, and 4) develop organizational systems that support the work of innovators and strategic thinkers throughout the organization.

Both Schein's (2010) recommendations for managed change and Deiss's (2004) actions for OD work can inform coherent next steps for strengthening IL culture. Obviously changing a culture to further favor IL is a huge undertaking and one that requires cooperation and blessings from library and institutional leaders in addition to the instruction librarians who agree to innovate. If key leaders of libraries are willing to adopt a managed change process, the steps listed below outline a roadmap to follow:

- Conduct organizational assessment
- Encourage courageous conversations
- Recognize and address change resistance
- Foster an inclusive dialogue/
Implement an action plan

The recommended four steps to build a more robust IL subculture are discussed more fully ahead.

ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT

Stephens and Russell (2004), Deiss (2004), and Schein (2010) all suggest conducting an organizational assessment or diagnosis prior to significant organizational change efforts in order to "identify cultural assumptions" (Schein 2010) or uncover "psychological contracts" (Kezar & Eckel 2002). For Schein (2010), the assessment process should first identify cultural assumptions, such as how important an

instructional subculture is to library staff or how staff view instruction in terms of priorities. Then, assumptions can be judged in terms of whether they are a strength or a constraint (pp. 316-7). Likewise, Kezar and Eckel (2002) suggest an important learning outcome from organizational diagnosis is the uncovering of "psychological contracts," or unwritten and often unspoken understanding held by individuals about library culture including expectations, privilege, power, obligations, and rewards.

A number of organizational assessment tools are available and there are precedents for their use in libraries and higher education. A number of libraries (Lakos & Phipps, 2004; Shepstone & Currie, 2008; Maloney, Antelman, Arlitsch, & Butler, 2010) used the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) and the Competing Values Framework (CVF) to evaluate and, later, change their organizational or occupational culture. These instruments allow both a process for identifying what needs to change in an organization's culture and a variety of subsequent strategies to initiate a culture change process (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). Lee, Hyman, and Luginbuhl (2007) promote a diagnostic tool (analyzing factors such as departmental vision, leadership, pressure for change, and reward structure) to assess departmental readiness for change. They concluded a department may better use its time and resources to establish a positive environment for change before actually initiating the change itself. Diagnosing change readiness and other forms of cultural assessment may uncover important issues or underlying assumptions that need attention in developing IL programs. Regardless of which tool is used, Schein (2010) stresses managed change processes should have explicit goals (p. 315). While these two examples are demonstrative of assessment

used in libraries and higher education, they are certainly not the only ones. Using assessments such as these in IL efforts can indicate or forewarn a change agent librarian of resistance issues that may arise during change processes. Regardless of which assessment tool is used, the results should provide a wealth of subjects to explore.

ENCOURAGE COURAGEOUS CONVERSATIONS

The second step on the roadmap for the development of IL subculture involves talking about assessment results and teaching concerns. One expert has pointed out that “the difficult truth is that meaningful, sustainable change at some point requires the hard work of dialogue and persuasion to build support and commitment to a new direction” (Chetkovich, 2004, p. 129). If constructive conversations about teaching and learning are a normal part of the library’s existing culture, the assessment will provide librarians an excellent foundation for planning and fostering larger dialogues with campus stakeholders in the future. Unfortunately, these types of conversations are not the norm in every library or on every campus. The authors’ lived experience suggests topics such as teaching philosophy—particularly the differences between bibliographic instruction and IL—norming rubrics, or appropriate workload can make it difficult to reach agreements amongst a group of librarians. If constructive conversations about teaching and learning are not the norm, it may be necessary to proceed directly to conversations strictly about the assessment results. If the assessment results are not interpreted as personal, discussions can begin to move an instructional group forward, leading to more “courageous conversations” or “a dialogue designed to

resolve competing priorities and beliefs while preserving relationships” (Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009, p. 304).⁴ In the context of IL programming, these conversations require the librarian who initiates them to take risks during talks with co-workers and to be assertive and honest about matters of importance to IL programs.

If the group of librarians is ready to talk about teaching concerns, Palmer (1998) makes suggestions that may be helpful to community building and development of IL subculture between librarians. He suggests it is crucial to gather together to explore teaching and learning if people want to grow in their teaching practice. Palmer delves further into building new norms by emphasizing a few important ideas for these types of gatherings. First, the members of the group have to be able to accept themselves as students who are learning from each other (p.141). Second, ground rules for dialogue must be established in order to “help us respect each other’s vulnerability and avoid chilling the conversation before it can even begin” (p. 150). Specifically he cautions:

Our tendency to reduce teaching to questions of technique is one reason we lack a collegial conversation of much duration or depth. Though technique talk promises the practical solution that we think we want and need, the conversation is stunted when technique is the only topic. The human issue in teaching gets ignored so the human beings who teach feel ignored as well. When teaching is reduced to technique, we shrink teachers as well as their craft...and people do not willingly return to a conversation that diminishes them. (Palmer, 1998, p. 145)

This advice could hold true not only for teaching, but also for discussing the concept and implications for embarking upon other IL initiatives.

The importance of initial conversation(s) cannot be overestimated because they are a key to establishing buy-in and a willingness to experiment with innovation that at least tries to move an IL program in a new direction. Conversations between at least two instruction librarians about shared concerns are where the process can start. It can also start with a candid and open conversation between a seasoned instruction librarian and the dean or other leader of the library system. This kind of talking can be informally described as a building block of trust between co-workers who are like-minded and who already have a bond because of instructional endeavors. More formally it can be described as a step toward the development of a more cohesive IL instructional subculture or community.

Regardless of where the courageous conversations start, the change agent instruction librarian must be mindful of the emotional realities and value building dynamics that are part of second order change and be able to frame the conversation(s) in the context of the good of the organization. The goal is to build further trust with others which will eventually result in a team that works together on instructional cohesiveness for future IL endeavors. These conversations may also provide an opportunity to collectively address issues of resistance that commonly accompany change.

RECOGNIZE AND ADDRESS CHANGE RESISTANCE

Some librarians may be unwilling to adopt changes because of an investment in the

status quo or discomfort with the implications of the way forward. In the context of IL program development, resistance can mean refusing to innovate or adopt a new programmatic direction because either current constraints do not allow for experimentation or there is a conviction that the status quo is best. Resistance can also be seen in arguments against change based on the level of current resources, time, or staffing. Knowing how to move forward confidently in spite of resistance is essential; this is where an understanding of resistance issues becomes helpful to the change agent instruction librarian and the people that he or she is working closely with for long term success.

Schein (2010), Palmer (1998), and Cheldelin (2000)—based on the work of Bridges in 1980—shed light on change processes within organizations. According to Cheldelin (2000), people resist transition more than change itself, because change just happens while transition is a gradual psychological process over time which requires a letting go of old attitudes, behaviors, and ways of doing things. Cheldelin uses the term “faces” to describe the ways resistance manifests itself interpersonally, intrapersonally, and departmentally. Examples include requesting more details before considering an initiative or flooding the leader with details and charges of too many demands already. She points out that, “unmanaged transitions are likely to be a significant source of resistance to any change initiative and might be the key to understanding resistance when [leaders] least predict it” (p. 62). She further notes that, “an excellent strategy when initiating any change project is to think about the transitional issues” (p.62).

In contrast, Schein (2010) explains

resistance by talking about fears: fear of temporary incompetence; punishment for incompetence; loss of personal identity; or loss of group membership. According to Schein, people can resist change with denial, scapegoating, or bargaining (p. 304). He also says, “the key to understanding resistance to change is to recognize that some behavior that has become dysfunctional for us may, nevertheless, be difficult to give up and replace because it serves other positive functions” (p. 301).

According to Schein (2010) learning anxiety, or anxious emotions that accompany learning new ways of perceiving, thinking and behaving, must be reduced (p. 303) rather than increased when instituting a change. As mentioned previously, IL demands an unfamiliar (and sometimes uncomfortable) role change with a steep learning curve for some academic librarians.⁵

Our research and lived experience suggest understanding the reasons and antidotes for resistance can be helpful to change agent librarians and their library leaders. Addressing resistance can happen through both the recognition of how emotional the process can be as well as providing multiple learning opportunities for librarians.

FOSTER AN INCLUSIVE DIALOGUE/ IMPLEMENT AN ACTION PLAN

Once acknowledgement of values and assumptions about instructional practice have been explored openly in courageous conversations and change resistance within the instructional or IL program have been addressed, there are many options for next steps. Assessment results, conversations, and resistance may reveal an internal action plan for librarians is necessary. For example, these factors may indicate

librarians are struggling to accept a more active role in the education process because they are uncomfortable with that role. Following Schein’s argument (2010, pp. 299-307), instruction librarians can then look for ways to reduce learning anxiety, increase trust, and create safe spaces to discuss teaching and learning. Reduction of learning anxiety can take on a variety of forms: professional development workshops, provision of library-related or campus generated teaching resources, collaborative classroom observations, or face-to-face conversations inspired by Palmer (1998). Throughout this process it is important to remember an action plan, often composed of small steps and replete with learning opportunities and built in rewards for librarians, cannot be effective unless it is tailored to the particular needs of a library environment.

On the other hand, fostering an inclusive dialogue with campus stakeholders may be more appropriate as a way to eventually effect internal growth. Palmer (1998) discusses how social (and educational reform) movements evolve and suggests that groups of people who offer support and opportunities to develop a shared vision can learn to convert concerns into public issues, or “go public” (p. 165). A number of libraries (Zald & Millet, 2012; Travis, 2008) have successfully persuaded campuses to embrace IL in this manner. Palmer (1998) counters this idea saying progress cannot emerge, “when we only talk to each other and not a larger audience...” (p. 175). Thus, in some instances, it may be more productive for change agent librarians to foster dialogues that include non-library faculty and administrators to investigate opportunities for participation outside of an immediate library context. Travis (2008) points out, “It is important to partner with people who will assist with initiatives and

are willing to be the first to embrace new curriculum” (p. 21-2). In some instances, the powerful force of external pressure can actually fuel ideas and initiate conversations that eventually develop shared vision within the library.

CONCLUSION: FOSTERING AN IL CULTURE

Bruch and Wilkinson (2012) note academic librarians have advanced IL practice yet “many libraries are still struggling to create a comprehensive information literacy culture” (p. 3). From the authors’ perspective, the time is right for the next stage of development of an internal subculture of teaching librarians. Gibson (2007) suggests the following:

In effect, academic librarians, through a full consideration of the implications for information literacy, are rethinking their roles in relation to potential partners in the academy, and have begun to understand the cultural shift that is required to implement information literacy at a deep, enterprise-wide level on their campuses. (p. 24)

In order to meet this challenge, a recognizable environment for IL practice inside academic library culture must exist. Currently IL initiatives can find their position fragile and uncertain as overall organizational priorities are evaluated against other historically well-established library values such as preservation and learning spaces, or new priorities such as digital initiatives. IL programs, policies, and initiatives need to be considered a high priority value supported by sustainable structures. The answer to sustainable IL programs and unquestionable value of their educational core lies in internal culture

building in the context of second order change.

Courage and agency are crucial components of meeting the challenge. Elmborg (2012) points to the fundamental importance of individual librarians and their willingness to risk participating in “Freire’s ongoing questioning and struggling for meaning” (p. 94). He emphasizes how critical it is to find ways “of being in the world and in our profession that are more rewarding and more humanizing” (p. 93). Oakleaf (2011) asks questions relevant to librarians in coming years including, “How committed are librarians to student learning? How committed are librarians to their own learning?” (p. 61). Hinchcliffe (2002) argues librarians need to not only “teach” IL but to live and model information literate habits of mind for other learners. Palmer (1998) addresses courage in teaching and the many risks and rewards it offers including community building and personal learning. These leaders have expected and invited others to join their courageous conversations. Now instruction librarians must take up these deeper challenges with conviction in their work environments.

Uncovering underlying assumptions, adopting managed change processes, and employing concepts borrowed from OD and change agency theory can provide a theoretical approach to strengthen IL culture. Conducting assessment to generate conversations, seeking inspiration from others in the educational reform movement, recognizing and addressing change resistance, and fostering further dialogues and action plans are coherent next steps in the process. Second order (transformative) change involves a process of deep engagement with each of the steps provided in this article’s roadmap in order to implement sustainable, responsive, and

culturally cohesive IL programs. Librarians themselves hold the power and integrity to create a secure future for IL program advancement by taking charge of the aforementioned challenges.

ENDNOTES

1. Schein is a professor emeritus at the MIT Sloan School of Management and the author of a number of books on organizational culture, career dynamics, and organizational learning and change.
2. This document is currently being revised under the leadership of an ACRL/IS Standards and Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians and Coordinators Task Force.
3. Lived experiences, or actual interpersonal occurrences that happen over time in the course of workplace IL program development, are sometimes overlooked as information sources or avoided because of their subjective nature. Our view is that lived experiences are essential, valid components to include when seeking full understanding of organizational phenomena.
4. The idea of courageous conversations draws on the positive organizational scholarship of Worline (2012) who writes about the “everyday actions in work contexts” (p.306) where courage is a “pattern of constructive opposition and where an individual stands against social forces in order to remedy duress in the organization” (p. 306-7). The person starting the conversation speaks with honesty and authenticity to address issues of concern in the shared work environment and frees others to also speak in a candid manner.
5. Learning anxiety associated with IL could come from a variety of workplace sources: a

mandate to teach (or to teach differently), experimenting with new pedagogical methods, running student learning assessments in classes, or streamlining an IL program’s learning outcomes or goals.

REFERENCES

- Association of College & Research Libraries. (2007). *Standards for Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians and Coordinators*. Retrieved June 1, 2014, from <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/profstandards>
- Association of College & Research Libraries. (2012). *Characteristics of programs of information literacy that illustrate best practices*. Retrieved June 1, 2013, from <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/characteristics>
- Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change Magazine*, 27(6), 12-25. doi: [10.1080/00091383.1995.10544672](https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.1995.10544672)
- Bennett, S. (2007). Campus cultures fostering information literacy. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 7(2), 147-67. doi: [10.1353/pla.2007.0013](https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2007.0013)
- Bridges, W. (1980). *Transitions: Making sense of life's changes*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Bruch, C., & Wilkinson, C. W. (2012). Surveying Terrain, Clearing Pathways. In C. W. Wilkinson & C. Bruch (Eds.), *Transforming Information Literacy Programs: Intersecting Frontiers of Self, Library Culture and Campus Community* (pp.3-44). Chicago, IL: ACRL.
- Budd, J. M. (2009). *Framing library*

instruction: A view from within and without. Chicago, IL: ACRL.

Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cheldelin, S. I. (2000). Handling resistance to change. In A. F. Lucas & Associates (Eds.), *Leading academic change: Essential roles for department chairs* (pp. 55-73). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chetkovich, C. (2004). Women's agency in a context of oppression: Assessing strategies for personal action and public policy. *Hypatia*, 19(4), 122-143. doi: [10.1111/j.1527-2001.2004.tb00151.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2004.tb00151.x)

Deiss, K. J. (2004). Innovation and strategy: Risk and choice in shaping user-centered libraries. *Library Trends*, 53(1), 17-32. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/1717>

Elmborg, J. K. (2012). Critical information literacy: Definitions and challenges. In C. W. Wilkinson & C. Bruch (Eds.), *Transforming Information Literacy Programs: Intersecting Frontiers of Self, Library Culture and Campus Community* (pp.75-95). Chicago, IL: ACRL.

Gibson, C. (2007). Information literacy and IT fluency: Convergences and divergences. *Reference and Users Services Quarterly*, 46 (3), 23-6, 59. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20864692>

Gilstrap, D. L. (2009). Librarians and the complexity of individual and organizational change: Case study findings of an emergent research library. *Advances in Library Administration and Organization*, 28, 1-58. doi: [10.1108/S0732-0671\(2009\)0000028004](https://doi.org/10.1108/S0732-0671(2009)0000028004)

Grassian, E. S., & Kaplowitz, J. R. (2009). *Information literacy instruction theory and practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Neal-Schuman Publishers.

Heifetz, R., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Hinchcliffe, L.J. (2001) Information literacy as a way of life. *Research Strategies* 18, 95-96.

Holloway, K. (2004). The significance of organizational development in academic research libraries. *Library Trends*, 53(1), 5-16. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/1721>

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2002). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: Universal principles or culturally responsive concepts? *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 435-60. doi: [10.1353/jhe.2002.0038](https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2002.0038)

Komives, S. R., Wagner, W., & Associates. (2009). *Leadership for a better world: Understanding the social change model of leadership development.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Lakos, A., & Phipps, S. (2004). Creating a culture of assessment: A catalyst for organizational change. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 4(3), 345-61. Retrieved from http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/v004/4.3lakos.pdf

Lee, V. S., Hyman, M.R., & Luginbuhl, G. (2007). The concept of readiness in the academic department: A case study of undergraduate education reform. *Innovative*

Higher Education, 32, 3-18. doi: [10.1007/s10755-006-9032-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-006-9032-6)

Maloney, K., Antelman, K., Arlitsch, K., & Butler, J. (2010). Future leaders' views on organizational culture. *College & Research Libraries*, 71(4), 322-34. Retrieved from <http://crl.acrl.org/content/71/4/322.full.pdf+html>

Oakleaf, M. (2011.) Are they learning? Are we? Learning and the academic library. *Library Quarterly*, 81(1), 61-82. doi: [10.1086/657444](https://doi.org/10.1086/657444)

Ondrusek, A. (2008). Information literacy. In M.L. Radford & P. Nelson (Eds.), *Academic library research perspectives and current trends* (pp. 48-81). Chicago, IL: ACRL.

Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Parsch, J.H., & Baughman, M.S. (2010). Toward healthy organizations: The use of organizational development in academic libraries. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 36(1), 3-19.

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Seymour, C. (2012). Ethnographic study of information literacy librarians' work experience: A report from two states. In C. W. Wilkinson & C. Bruch (Eds.), *Transforming Information Literacy Programs: Intersecting Frontiers of Self, Library Culture and Campus Community* (pp.45-71). Chicago, IL: ACRL.

Shepstone, C., & Currie, L. (2008). *Transforming the academic library: Creating*

an organizational culture that fosters staff success. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 34(4), 358-68. doi: [10.1016/j.acalib.2008.05.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2008.05.008)

Stephens, D., & Russell, K. (2004). Organizational development, leadership, change, and the future of libraries. *Library Trends*, 53(1), 238-57. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/1727>

Travis, T. A. (2008). Librarians as agents of change: Working with curriculum committees using change agency theory. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 114, 17-33. doi: [10.1002/tl.314](https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.314)

Worline, M.C. (2012). Courage in organizations: An integrative review of the "difficult virtue". In K. S. Cameron & G. M. Spreitzer, (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*. (pp. 304-315). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Zald, A.E., & Millet, M. (2012). Hitching your wagon to institutional goals. In C. W. Wilkinson & C. Bruch (Eds.), *Transforming Information Literacy Programs: Intersecting Frontiers of Self, Library Culture and Campus Community* (pp.119-130). Chicago, IL: ACRL.